

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	NORTHERN DISTRI	DISTRICT COURT ICT OF CALIFORNIA E DIVISION
3	FINJAN, INC.,	Case No. 5:13-CV-05808-BLF-HRL
5	Plaintiff,	DECLARATION OF SAM STAKE IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS
6	vs.	PROOFPOINT, INC. AND ARMORIZE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S
7	PROOFPOINT, INC. AND ARMORIZE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,	ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO BRIEF ADDITIONAL CLAIM
8	Defendants.	TERMS FOR CONSTRUCTION, FOR ADDITIONAL PAGES FOR CLAIM CONSTRUCTION BRIEFING, AND TO
20		FILE A CLAIM CONSTRUCTION SURREPLY
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		Case No. 5:13-CV-05808-BLF

STAKE DECLARATION ISO PROOFPOINT'S ADMIN. MOT. RE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

- I, Sam Stake, declare as follows:
- 2 | 1. I am an attorney licensed in good standing in the State of California, and have filed a notice of appearance in this Court in this litigation. (Dkt. No. 111.)
 - 2. I am an associate at Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP, and I represent Proofpoint, Inc. and Armorize Technologies, Inc. (collectively "Proofpoint"). I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and, if called as a witness, could and would testify to such facts under oath.
 - 3. I submit this declaration in support of Proofpoint's Administrative Motion for Leave To Brief Additional Claim Terms for Construction, For Additional Pages for Claim Construction Briefing, and To File a Claim Construction Surreply.
 - 4. On January 22, 2015, counsel for Proofpoint met and conferred by telephone with counsel for Finjan for the purpose of narrowing claim construction terms in dispute and identifying the most significant terms to the resolution of the case.
 - 5. During this meeting, counsel for Finjan declined to attempt to reach agreement on any claim terms in dispute, and instead stated that it would identify any terms it agreed to in the draft of the parties' Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement.
 - 6. Counsel for Finjan sent its draft of the Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement to counsel for Proofpoint on January 23, 2015. This draft contained only two terms identified as constructions upon which the parties agreed.
 - 7. In response, counsel for Proofpoint agreed to Finjan's proposed constructions for three additional terms.
 - 8. On February 3, 2015, counsel for Proofpoint wrote to counsel for Finjan to ask for Finjan's consent to the following modifications to claim construction briefing: an additional 10 pages for opening and responsive claim construction briefs; a 15-page surreply brief for Proofpoint, and to not limit the number of claim terms briefed, subject to the page limit for the claim construction briefs. Alternatively, Proofpoint's counsel requested a meet and confer to discuss the modifications. Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** is a true and correct copy of this correspondence.

Case 4:13-cv-05808-HSG Document 119-1 Filed 02/06/15 Page 3 of 3

9. On February 4, 2015, counsel for Proofpoint and counsel for Finjan met and conferred regarding Proofpoint's request for modifications to claim construction briefing. Counsel for Finjan indicated that Finjan's counsel did not agree to Proofpoint's proposal for modification of claim construction briefing. Therefore, Proofpoint could not obtain a stipulation under Civil L.R. 7-12. I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, CA on February 6, 2015. Respectfully submitted, QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP By Sam Stake Attorneys for Defendants PROOFPOINT, INC. and ARMORIZE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

-2-